



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO.                         | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.   | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|-------------|----------------------|-----------------------|------------------|
| 10/754,375                              | 01/09/2004  | Velda Bartek         | RSW920030211US1 (125) | 7782             |
| 46320                                   | 7590        | 10/03/2007           |                       |                  |
| CAREY, RODRIGUEZ, GREENBERG & PAUL, LLP |             |                      | EXAMINER              |                  |
| STEVEN M. GREENBERG                     |             |                      | ULRICH, NICHOLAS S    |                  |
| 950 PENINSULA CORPORATE CIRCLE          |             |                      |                       |                  |
| SUITE 3020                              |             |                      |                       |                  |
| BOCA RATON, FL 33487                    |             |                      |                       |                  |
|   |             |                      | ART UNIT              | PAPER NUMBER     |
|   |             |                      | 2173                  |                  |
|   |             |                      | MAIL DATE             | DELIVERY MODE    |
|   |             |                      | 10/03/2007            | PAPER            |

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/754,375

Applicant(s)

BARTEK ET AL.

Examiner

Nicholas S. Ulrich

Art Unit

2173

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 July 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

## Attachment(s)

- ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

Art Unit: 2173

1. This action is in response to the amendment and remarks filed on 7/16/2007.
2. Claims 1-16 are pending.
3. Claims 1-16 are rejected.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1, 3, 5-11, 13, 15, and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hickman et al (US 5361361) in view of Lillie et al. (US 2005/0065913 A1).

In regard to **claim 1**, Hickman discloses a method for producing a composite help view for an aggregation of applications, the method comprising the steps of:

obtaining at least two separate help documents, each of said at least two separate help documents having an association with a corresponding one of separate interface units (*Column 7 lines 37-44 and lines 55-57: Hickman discusses extracting help topic and subtopic descriptors for each of the application in the installed application list*);

combining said at least two separate help documents into a composition of help documents (*Fig 5 Bookcase help window; Fig 6 elements 618, 620, 622, 624, 628, 626, and 630; and Column 7 lines 43-46: Hickman discusses extracting help topics and listing them in the help utility window for each of the applications in the installed application list. Fig 5 shows a help window with help descriptors for 2 applications listed together in one composition*);

and, rendering said composition of help documents in a help system view (*Column 7 lines 59-62: Hickman discusses the help utility window will **display** help topic designators for each application*).

Hickman fails to disclose "interface units aggregated together into a single aggregated view", "help documents corresponding to said single aggregated view", and "rendering responsive to a request for help initiated in said single aggregated view".

However, Lillie discloses interface units aggregated together into a single aggregated view (*Fig 5 and Paragraph 0054 lines 5-12: four portlets are aggregated to one portal view*); help documents corresponding to said single aggregated view (*Paragraph 0058: Help files can be linked. It is inherent that these help files would correspond the portlets within the portal page*); and rendering help files responsive to request for help initiated in single aggregated view (*Paragraph 0058: input and output mechanisms can be employed for various communications. Help files can be linked for **manual invocation***)

Lillie does not explicitly explain the operation of the help files associated with the portal page but does discuss the inclusion of such a feature. Since both Hickman and Lillie's field of endeavor deal with aggregating multiple computer content together, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Lillie and Hickman in order to create a single help file directory associated with an aggregate application like a portal. One skilled in the art would be motivated to combine Hickman and Lillie in order to combine various help utilities for applications present on a given system, into a unified interface which hierarchically defines all the help information, as suggested by Hickman (*Column 1 lines 24-47*). It would also be obvious to modify Hickman's invention to populate a list of installed applications present in the portal page rather than programs installed within the entire system. The list of installed portlets (programs), in a given portal, would easily be determined based on the stored portal configuration file (*Lillie: Paragraphs 0043 and 0048: The portal configuration includes the definition of portlets within the portal page*).

In regard to **claim 3**, Hickman discloses a method wherein said rendering step comprises the step of rendering both a view of said composition of help documents, and individual views of said separate help documents (*Fig 5 and Column 6 lines 64-66*: *Thus, the present invention integrates the **display** and **selection** of help directory information into a **single window**. The **display** of help information is performed by help*

viewer while the **selection** of help information is performed by the integrated help utility (bookcase) Both are present in a single window on the display system).

In regard to **claim 5**, Hickman discloses a method further comprising the steps of:

changing said composition of help documents to include a new separate help document corresponding to said at least one different interface unit (*Column 2 lines 20-26*);

and, rendering said changed composition of help documents in a help system view responsive to a request for help initiated in said updated single aggregated view (*Column 7 lines 31-34 and lines 59-62: Hickman discusses the use of help utility window for displaying the help topics associated with the given applications on a system. It is inherently shown that when a new application is installed, the help file will display this new application*).

Hickman fails to disclose updating said single aggregated view to include at least one different interface unit.

However, Lillie discloses updating single aggregated view to include at least one different interface unit (*Paragraph 0037 lines 1-4; Paragraph 0038-0039: Paragraph 0037 discusses the use of profiles for the UI, paragraph 0038 discusses a user with the ability to change those profiles, and paragraph 0039 discusses dynamic changes to*

*profiles. When profiles are changed, the portlets associated with the profiles are modified resulting in the ability to add portlets).*

Both Lillie and Hickman discuss adding new interface units to their inventions, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to combine the teachings of Hickman and Lillie.

In regard to **claim 6**, Hickman fails to disclose further comprising the step of restricting help information in said composition of help documents for a particular user to reflect restrictions in said single aggregated view imposed upon said user.

However, Lillie discloses different UI profiles based on the user (*Paragraph 0037*). The combination of Hickman and Lillie would result in obtaining a list of portlets available to a particular user and integrating the help information associated with the obtained list to create an aggregated view of all the pertinent help files. Therefore, a particular user would only be supplied help information relating to their particular profile, which would reflect the restrictions within the aggregated view imposed on the user.

Lillie does not explicitly explain the operation of the help files associated with the portal page but does discuss the inclusion of such a feature. Since both Hickman and Lillie's field of endeavor deal with aggregating multiple computer content together, it

would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Lillie and Hickman in order to create a single help file directory associated with an aggregate application like a portal. One skilled in the art would be motivated to combine Hickman and Lillie in order to combine various help utilities for applications present on a given system, into a unified interface which hierarchically defines all the help information, as suggested by Hickman (*Column 1 lines 24-47*).

In regard to **claim 7**, Hickman discloses a system for producing a composite help view for an aggregation of applications comprising:

a help system configured to render a help system view comprising composite help documentation comprising at least two help documents, each of said at least two help documents corresponding to one of said individual interface units (*Figure 5*);

and help invoking logic couples to said help system and disposed in said single aggregated view (*Column 6 lines 37-47*).

Hickman fails to disclose "an application aggregator configured to aggregate individual interface units into a single aggregated view". However, Lillie discloses an aggregator configured to aggregate individual interface units into a single aggregated view (*Paragraph 0034 lines 1-20: It is inherent that Lillie's invention contains some kind of aggregator for creating the portal page. The portal page is made up of portlets, which*



Art Unit: 2173

*are configurable by a user. If a user has the ability to configure the portal page, there must be an aggregator of some kind to include all the portlets within the portal). Also hick man discloses help invoking logic (Paragraph 0058: input and output mechanisms can be employed for various communications. Help files can be linked for **manual invocation**).*

Lillie does not explicitly explain the operation of the help files associated with the portal page but does discuss the inclusion of such a feature. Since both Hickman and Lillie's field of endeavor deal with aggregating multiple computer content together, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Lillie and Hickman in order to create a single help file directory associated with an aggregate application like a portal. One skilled in the art would be motivated to combine Hickman and Lillie in order to combine various help utilities for applications present on a given system, into a unified interface which hierarchically defines all the help information, as suggested by Hickman (*Column 1 lines 24-47*).

In regard to **claim 8**, Lillie further teaches wherein said individual interface units are application portlets, wherein said single aggregated view is a portal, and wherein said application aggregator is disposed within a portal server (*Paragraphs 0054-0055 line 4*).

In regard to **claim 9**, Hickman discloses wherein said help system is configured as a plug-in to an integrated development environment (*Column 7 lines 19-22: part of an application software package*)

In regard to **claim 10**, Hickman discloses a system wherein said help system further comprises a configuration for generating a personalized bookshelf for said at least two help documents (*Figure 5 Bookcase*).

In regard to **claims 11, 13, 15, and 16**, System claims 11, 13, 15 and 16 correspond generally to method claims 1, 3, 5, and 6, respectively, and recite similar features in system form, and therefore are rejected under the same rationale.

5. Claims 2, 4, 12 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hickman et al (US 5361361) in view of Lillie et al. (US 2005/0065913 A1) in view of Palaniappan et al (US 2002/0054152 A1).

In regard to **claims 2 and 12**, Hickman discloses a method wherein said rendering step further comprises the steps loading an index (*Column 7 lines 35-37: Hickman discusses generating a list based on programs currently installed on system*); forming a help system navigation view based upon said index (*Column 7 lines 46-55: Hickman discusses maintaining a window position for each topic or subtopic*);

and, rendering said help system navigation view along with said rendering of said composition of help documents (*Column 6 lines 64-66: Thus, the present invention integrates the **display** and **selection** of help directory information into a **single window**. The **display** of help information is performed by help viewer while the **selection** of help information is performed by the integrated help utility (bookcase) Both are present in a single window on the display system).*

Hickman and Lillie fail to disclose a navigation view disposed within said single aggregated view. As mentioned above, Hickman does discuss creating an index based on the installed programs within the system.

However, Palaniappan discloses a navigation view disposed within said single aggregated view (*Paragraph 0039: The left column shows a list of functionality that is associated with each application running in the window*)

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to combine the teachings of Hickman, Lillie, and Palaniappan to dispose a navigation view within single aggregated view. The motivation would to provide menus that access the functionality of the programs installed on a given platform (*See Palaniappan Paragraph 0013*)

In regard to **claim 4 and 14**, Hickman discloses rendering a help system view (*Figure 5: The bookcase is considered to be the help system view*), activating a rendering of said view of said composition of help documents responsive to a selection

(*Column 5 lines 55-63*) and otherwise activating a rendering of a single one of said separate help documents responsive to selection (*Column 6 lines 37- 47*).

Hickman and Lillie both fail to disclose "obtaining image map of said single aggregated view", "rendering said image map" and "selection of a portion of said image map".

However Palaniappan discloses obtaining image map of said single aggregated view (*Paragraph 0049*), rendering said image map (*Paragraph 0049 and Fig 6: Palaniappan discusses "how the user can see"* ), and selection of a portion of said image map (*Paragraph 0050*).

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to combine the teachings of Hickman, Lillie, and Palaniappan to obtain an image map and apply it to the help system. The motivation to combine would have been to determine what applications are present in the given aggregated document and displaying them to the user in a clickable map.

### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments filed 7/16/2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

6. In regard to applicants argument that the examiner has failed to establish that either Hickman or Lillie teach or suggest the claimed composition of help documents corresponding to a single aggregated view, the examiner disagrees. Hickman's invention is directed towards aggregating a plurality of help documents that represent

Art Unit: 2173

applications that are installed on a given operating system. This is accomplished by determining a list of application programs installed within the system, extract help topic descriptors from each of the applications on the list, and combining them into hierarchal help utility storage area for retrieval by a user. Lillie's invention is directed towards portal pages with aggregate a plurality of portlets into a single aggregated view. It is well known in the art that portlets are applications that are managed and displayed by a portal page. When combining Hickman's and Lillie's invention, it would be obvious to aggregate the help files associated with the portlets. First, as discussed in the rejection of claim 1, a list of portlets present in a given aggregated view (portal page) would be obtained from the portal configuration of Lillie's invention. Then Hickman's invention would extract the help topics for each of the portlets present within the portal configuration, and then combine them into a hierarchal help utility storage area for retrieval by a user. By combining the single aggregated view of Lillie's invention, with the methods of Hickman's invention, we would reach the claimed limitation of a composition of help documents corresponding to a single aggregated view.

In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, one skilled in the

art would be motivated to combine Hickman and Lillie in order to combine various help utilities for applications present on a given system, into a unified interface which hierarchically defines all the help information available to a user, as suggested by Hickman (*Column 1 lines 24-47*). Both Hickman's and Lillie's invention deal with aggregating computer content together. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill having the teachings of Hickman and Lillie before him to modify Hickman's invention to aggregate the help files of applications present within a portal page. As discussed in the background section of Hickman's invention, application programs are developed by more than one software vendor, which result in various help utility implementations. This can also be said for portal pages. Portal pages are made of diverse portlets, which are applications that can be developed by a plurality of software vendors. Therefore, as discussed by Hickman, there is a need to aggregate help files associated with a plurality of applications, in order to obtain a single unified interface for accessing help files of a plurality of application programs.

7. In regard to applicant's argument that Hickman does not teach or suggest the limitations of claim 3 and 13, the examiner disagrees. Applicant asserts that claims 3 and 13 teach rendering at least three views: (i) the composition of help documents and (ii)/(iii) individual views of help documents. Examiner cited column 6 lines 64-66 of Hickman's disclosure, which states, "the present invention integrates the display and selection of help directory information from multiple applications into a single window". This cited passage is further explained in Figure 5 of Hickman's disclosure. Figure 5

Art Unit: 2173

clearly shows composition of help documents (Bookcase Help) and individual views of separate help documents (application 1 and 2). The cited passage describes the selection of help directory information. This is accomplished from the composition of help documents displayed in the Bookcase. The passage further describes the display of help directory information. By selecting a topic listed in the bookcase, the help information is displayed within a window represented in figure 5. The passage further states integrated into a single window. Therefore, the composition of help documents and individual views of separate help documents are all displayed within a single window all at once.

8. In regard to applicant's argument of claim 7, the examiner disagrees. With regard to the combination of Hickman and Lillie, examiner incorporates herein, the response to the first argument. Also, to better explain the help invoking logic, examiner has cited the passage (*Column 6 lines 37-47*) from Hickman's disclosure. Explained in this passage is the ability for a user to select a particular help topic for viewing.

### ***Conclusion***


9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nicholas S. Ulrich whose telephone number is 571-270-1397. The examiner can normally be reached on M-TH 9:00 - 5:00 EST.

Art Unit: 2173

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor John Cabeca can be reached on 571-272-4048. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Nicholas Ulrich  
4/10/2007  
2173



JOHN CABECA  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER